

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

at "Wesley Chapel." This arrangement it appears did not meet the approval of the Trustees and Superintendents of that church, and it was determined by them that the colored children should be excluded from the house. The following extract from the "Daily Gazette," gives a correct account of the affair:

"At the hour named for assembling, some 150 of the children, headed by Rev. Mr. Emery, the City Missionary, and one or two others, marched to the door of Wesley Chapel, where they were met by Messrs. Rowland and Birdsell, the Superintendents, who informed them that they could not be admitted. Mr. Emery rather insisted, and wished to be informed of the ground of exclusion, but was not gratified, the gentlemen who occupied the door declining to enter into a discussion, or make any explanation. They were positive in their refusal, and stated that they were unanimously sustained by the Trustees.

"The gentlemen in charge of the colored schools then marched the children up Fifth street, to the crossing of Broadway, and thence down the opposite side of the walk to the front of the church, where they halted, and the children sang, in a loud tone, the Anniversary Hymn.

"O, do not be discouraged,
For Jesus is your Friend."

"By this time a large crowd assembled in the street, composed of both whites and blacks, when Mr. Emery made a brief address, in which he stated they were not excluded by reason of bad conduct, or unchristian habits, but simply because their skins were darker than those of others though he hoped their hearts were as pure. A prayer was then offered, when the children sang another hymn, and then marched to the Baker Street Church, where appropriate exercises were had. A set of resolutions referring to their exclusion from Wesley Chapel, were subsequently adopted by those present at the Baker Street Church. The affair created some little excitement in the neighborhood of the Chapel, but the colored people conducted themselves with much modesty and propriety. We imagine it would be rather difficult to reconcile this proceeding on the part of the Trustees and Superintendents with the spirit and precepts of the gospel."

The "Baker Street Church" to which the colored schools were compelled to go, is the colored Baptist church of this city. The following are the resolutions at the time:

"WHEREAS, According to invitation from the committee of arrangements, this school proceeded to unite with the Sabbath Schools in this city in a mass meeting, and whereas, upon going to Wesley Chapel, the place which had been published by the said committee as the one where we would be expected, admission was denied us because of our color, therefore,

"Resolved, That the confidence with which we accepted the invitation has been forfeited, creating a breach, which can be remedied only by that repentance from sin which has not been found by those who closed the doors against us.

"Resolved, That our Superintendent, Rev. Joseph Emery, being identified with the Cincinnati Sabbath School Union, is entitled to our gratitude for the faithfulness with which he remonstrated, and the fidelity with which he stood by us. In conclusion, we have no feelings of animosity against those who closed the house of God against us, but will pray God to grant them repentance."

The above resolutions were passed unanimously. A few more such manifestations, will, we think, establish the character of our churches for proslavery orthodoxy, to the entire satisfaction of their Southern brethren. Such a course ought to secure the Southern trade to our church-going, salary-paying, negro-hating merchants, for we fear with all their parade about Sunday schools, they will find in the day of judgment that they have no reward in heaven. We have neither space nor language to express our abhorrence of such arrant hypocrisies.]

MORE RESCUE TRIALS.

The southern District of Ohio is to be defied by another rescue trial in the United States Court. Reuben Johnson, a colored man, has been arrested for an attempt to rescue the fugitive slave Jackson, at Zanesville. We infer, from the high colored description of the triumph of the Marshal and posse in that affair, as given in the veracious democratic organs, that he could not have been in any danger; but the Marshal is like the monkey in the litigation of the cats about the division of the cheese, in the fable; justice may be satisfied, but the Marshal is not. These are refreshing reasons to the Marshals. The litigation is usually extensive and protracted, all of which makes fees for the Marshal and an unlimited number of deputies. Their patriotism is quite as natural and disinterested as that of Ancient Pistol. "I shall be suter to the camp, and profits will accrue."

It is hardly to be expected that a colored man will have a profound respect for a law that enslaves him. Some of our contemporaries of the national democratic organs, would undoubtedly look down and worship a law that consigned them to the slave trader; it would not be much of a change for them; but humanity is usually expected to rebel against the slavery of its own race, no matter how well established by legislation; and though men may concede the blinding effect of the fugitive slave law upon white men, they hold resistance to any law enslaving their own race as the first requisite of manhood.

The negro certainly has the same right to rebel against negro slavery that a white man has against white slavery. If risking life to rescue a brother is a crime—one case, it is in the other. Democracy frequently declares that our government was made only for white men. The negro has no compromise to fulfill; he has no rights that a white man is bound to respect; and his attempt to rescue his brother from slavery can hardly be regarded as a violation of law. It is certainly worth every one with the soul of a man would do for his own race, and it is not a case that calls for the vengeance of the law; but Uncle Sam is a good paymaster; the fat pickings afforded by these trials have acquired a notoriety in Southern Ohio; it is known that the department will stand any bills that may be presented in these cases, reasoning very sensibly that such blood money can go into no other than democratic hands. "Hinc illa lacrymæ,"—hence this zeal in the Marshal for the rescue of the fugitive slave law.—*State Journal.*

Another Serp.—The Southern Convention in session at Vicksburg has declared by a large majority in favor of the African Slave Trade, and also that the act of Congress prohibiting the same and subjecting those engaging in it to the pains and penalties inflicted for the crime of piracy, is unconstitutional. This is another step towards the Africanization of the American Continent—the first in the series having been the repeal of the Missouri Compromise which paved the way for

the second, to wit: the Dred Scott decision. The territories having been thrown open to Slavery, the re-opening of the African Slave Trade is a natural sequence, and as the Democratic party endorsed the former at the bidding of its Southern masters, there is no reason to doubt but that in due time it will signify its acceptance of the latter. To complete the mission of latter-day Democracy, only one more step is necessary—namely, the extension of the principle of the Dred Scott decision to the Free States as well as to the Territories. When this shall have been done, and it will be done speedily unless the power of the sham Democracy be broken—Senator Toombs may call his slave roll within the shadow of Bunker Hill, and Senator Douglas may stock his Illinois farm from his Mississippi plantation.—*Chicago Press.*

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The following are the Resolutions adopted by the Parent Society at its recent meeting:

Resolved, That if transforming rational and immortal beings into merchandise and perishable property be not a sin of the first magnitude, and a crime of the deepest dye, then crime and sin nowhere exist on earth, and there are none to be called to repentance.

Resolved, That, conceding to Southern slaveholders the right to hold slaves on Southern soil, and affirming that they may, and in many cases do, exercise the right in accordance with justice, humanity and the spirit of Christianity, is tantamount to a vindication of slavery universally; and therefore, in advocating the re-establishment of the slave system, wherever it has been abolished at the North, the South acts with strict logical consistency, and cannot be met or answered, except by those who maintain the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding under all circumstances.

Resolved, That they who have no moral objection to the existence of slavery at the South can have none to its existence at the North; and that all such, by their constant defence of the slaveholder from the imputation of criminality, are, as far as in them lies, preparing the way for the introduction of slavery into every free State.

Resolved, That between the recognition of the slave as a man, endowed by his Creator with an inalienable right to liberty, and therefore entitled to immediate and unconditional emancipation, and the denial of his common human nature, and his association with cattle, swine and other property, there is no half-way ground.

Resolved, That the enormities of slavery are so multitudinous and appalling—in its annihilation of all human rights, its sacrifice of all parental and filial ties, its contempt for all the laws of God, its disregard of all the commands of the Gospel—that to resist its immediate and total abolition is the most comprehensive method of extending and perpetuating the kingdom of Satan, and opening the flood gates of all iniquity.

Resolved, That the friends of the enslaved in this land have nothing to retract or modify in regard to their charges against the holders of slaves, or their abettors—against the American Church, and the clergy of the country generally—against the political parties and their leaders—against the American Constitution and Union; based as those charges are, and have been, upon a broad foundation of facts, which cannot be refuted, and which still remain unchanged.

Resolved, That we cordially accept the taunting admonition of Southern slaveholders, "Mind your own business," as it is our business to see that we neither oppress nor connive at oppression; that we reduce to practice the "self-evident truths" of the Declaration of Independence; that we "hide the outcast, and tarry not him that wandereth"; that we make our soil free to every fugitive slave who stands upon it, and that we cleanse ourselves from all blood guiltiness.

Resolved, That it is the wildest incoherence, on the part of the South, in one breath to charge us of the North with meddling with that which does not concern us, and for which we are not responsible, and, in the next, to remind us of the proslavery constitutional guarantees we have given her, and insist upon our fulfilling them to the letter—requiring us to allow the slave hunter to seize his victims in any part of the Northern domains—to recognize slave property in all the Territories of the Union—to perpetuate a slave representation in Congress—to guarantee the suppression of every slave insurrection, even by the strong arm of the National Government, if need be—to consent to the admission into the Union of as many slave States as can be created, and however created—and to aid in the extension of slavery by the acquisition of new territory, obtained whether by purchase, bribery, perfidy, invasion or conquest.

Resolved, That it is the rightful business and imperative duty of the people of the North, without delay, to withdraw themselves from their present alliance with the Southern traffickers in human flesh—to proclaim the unnatural and guilty compact between the free States and the slave States at an end, and to take such measures for the formation of a Northern Union as shall be in accordance with the principles of justice, humanity and impartial liberty.

Resolved, That we renew our previously declared testimony against the Colonization Society, for the reasons we have so often assigned, and will spare no occasion to pass unimproved by which we may contribute to put an end to its mischievous spirit and designs, in fostering and perpetuating the hateful and unrighteous prejudice against the proscribed and persecuted colored people of this country.

Resolved, That while in direct and ceaseless labor for such a revolution in public sentiment as shall secure the total abolition of slavery is our chief and fundamental mission, we recognize in the recent efforts in Massachusetts, New York and elsewhere, for the unqualified prohibition of slave-hunting, a most timely and important work and one which should engage the earnest and untiring co-operation of every Abolitionist, and of all who would have Northern soil truly free and really "an asylum for the oppressed."

Resolved, That we especially recommend to the members and friends of the American Anti-Slavery Society in the several States which it represents to at once begin the work of circulating petitions, addressed to their respective Legislatures, demanding the entire prohibition of slave-hunting on their soil.

Resolved, That among the tried and faithful friends of the Anti-Slavery cause who have been removed by death since the last anniversary of this Society, and whose memories deserve to be gratefully and admiringly cherished for their work's sake, ELIAS GRAY LORING stands conspicuous, having given the earliest public adhesion to an enterprise at that time without friends, and everywhere bitterly hated and proscribed, and sustained by a life of the purest integrity, of, and yet,

deepest conscientiousness, of the most perfect disinterestedness and the highest moral integrity.

Resolved, That in the death of Judge WILLIAM JAY, the slave loses a firm, fearless and devoted friend—one of the few Americans who lived equal to the noble Anti-Slavery name he inherited—one whose early and earnest advocacy of emancipation, whose sacrifice of office for his principles and whose contributions to Anti-Slavery argument and literature, second to none in value and importance, place him in the front rank of those to whom these States will owe, at some future happy day, their salvation from their foulest sin.

Resolved, That an early, intrepid and devoted advocate of the enslaved in our land has been removed by the death of ARNOLD BUEFF, at a ripe old age—one of the signers of the Declaration of Anti-Slavery Sentiments at Philadelphia in 1833, and one of the twelve who organized the New England (now the Massachusetts) Anti-Slavery Society, and its first public lecturer in the enforcement of the doctrine of immediate and unconditional emancipation, to whose earnest and impressive appeals many trace their conversion to the Anti-Slavery cause—he never allowing an opportunity to pass without bearing an uncompromising testimony against the sinfulness of slavery.

Resolved, That this Society is profoundly sensible of the loss it has experienced in the recent death of CHARLES F. HOVEY, for many years an active member and officer of this Society; that they feel deeply the withdrawal of an example so full of fidelity to conscience and of faith in the omnipotence of truth and in the single expediency of the Right; of a character so marked by the highest independence, the sternest integrity, the wisest sagacity; of a life so informed with love, with charity, with goodness and with courage.

Resolved, That as Abolitionists especially we mourn the loss of a companion so brave, so earnest, so wise and munificent, whose best counsels, whose consistent example, whose ready hand were never withheld from the needs of the Cause, and the benediction of whose countenance gave us hope and comfort in the most trying hours.

Resolved, That we will endeavor to mourn him aright by endeavoring to be, like him, full of faith in the power of ideas and full of good works towards their victory.

Resolved, That the President of this Society be instructed to convey the widow and family of our deceased brother the assurance of our sympathy in their grief and in their love and admiration of his character, which must prove its best earthly consolation.

[The following is from a photographic report of the proceedings of the American Anti-Slavery Society by J. M. Y. Yerrinton.]

SPEECH OF PARKER PILLSBURY.

THURSDAY MORNING, May 10th.

MR. PRESIDENT: It is one of the most disagreeable duties of an Abolitionist to have to address a public assembly at its opening session, on his own account; but when he has to do so as a substitute for another, and that other a very desirable advocate, it becomes still more embarrassing and unpleasant. [Rev. A. M. MILLIGAN, of Philadelphia was expected to make the opening address, but had not arrived at this time.]

I should like to preface the few remarks I have to offer with two additional resolutions:

Resolved, That while we rejoice in all the indications of an advancing state of public opinion against slavery, we would still be mindful that our greatest danger is not from actual slaveholders, and the open, bold and blasphemous defenders and extensors of the institution in State or Church, in politics or pulpit, but rather from those who make species and strong anti-slavery pretensions and professions, like the Republican party, the Boston American Tract Society, the recently formed New England and New York Church Anti-Slavery Society, the New York Independent, with its array of clerical editors and contributors, that are still in governmental or ecclesiastical union and fellowship with slavery and slaveholders.

Resolved, That while these organizations are through their professions and professions, able to absorb the awakened public sympathy, control the public charity, paralyze the public conscience, and pervert every well-intended action into channels that flow only with compromise, corruption and crime, it becomes our duty faithfully to rebuke them, and to warn the people against them, as the enemies of that only radical and genuine gospel through which, under God, deliverance can come to the enslaved.

There seems no need to argue or defend propositions so plain as those in the resolutions read. There certainly can be no need of any argument as to the character and quality of the proslavery political parties and churches of the country. If there were need of it, Dr. Cheever is far more able than I am to do that work, and quite as ready and willing. But the question is, who shall rebuke Dr. Cheever? The question is, who shall examine, illustrate and report upon the character and quality of what we call Anti-Slavery in the Church and in the Government? There certainly is great need of new definitions in our country. The reading of that Belgian protest is very significant in exhibiting the necessity of such definitions. Here is an Address, earnest, sincere, honest, well-meant in every respect; but it is a very badly directed address. There is a strange and very unfortunate misnomer about it. It is directed to those "Churches and Christians in the United States who uphold slavery!" [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, it is time this Society, or some other gathering, should instruct the Christians in Belgium, if they have them there, and in all other parts of the world, on that particular subject. They have no conception of what slavery is. If they understood what it is in our country, and what it is to sustain and uphold it, not to say extend it, they never would address any memorial in that way. We have other evils in our country besides slavery, small in comparison, but still evils. We have horse-stealing, we have robbery of hen-roosts, we have adultery and adulterers, and we have all the details of crime and sin forbidden and condemned in the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount; but how would a petition, or remonstrance, look, coming from Great Britain or from the Continent, addressed "to those Christians and Christian Churches of the United States that uphold horse-stealing?"—"to those Christians and Christian Churches in the United States that uphold adultery and fornication?"—"to those Christians and Christian Churches in the United States that rob hen-roosts or establish and institute the robbing of hen-roosts?" If the people of those countries understood slavery to be as bad as the robbing of hen-roosts, they would not charge our Christians and Christian Churches with it. They would conceive it in bad taste to do so, and would not do so, for that reason, if for no other. Here we have slavery. We talk about it as "the sum of all villainies," but "villany" has come to be so moderate a term in our country that "the sum of all villainies" is not much to be ashamed of. We have slavery—an unutterable, indescribable abomination. Language breaks down when we attempt to describe it. Every other sin in the land pales into innocence when you speak of slavery; and yet,

there is such a mistaken conception of its character, in every country of the civilized world, that it is really supposed and believed that Christians may honestly uphold and extend the institution. Now, I think we must have new definitions of Christian and Christianity, of the Church and of Ministers, of the Gospel, and all those technical religious terms. Let the whole vocabulary be changed, or else let us make it understood that slavery is a thing so utterly horrible and atrocious in its character and in its quality that no one can even presume it possible that Christians can hold slaves.

But, then, we must not wonder that the Belgian Churches make that mistake, for in our country the same difficulty exists. We have just had formed in Massachusetts a "Church Anti-Slavery Association." It is made up entirely of ministers and members of evangelical Churches. There was assumed to be a necessity for it, on the part of those under whose auspices it was formed, because as they said, there was no Church organization bearing a testimony against slavery. They summoned all the spirit and energy they could arouse in the Churches of New England and New York, and there gathered in the City of Worcester some fifty ministers and members of the various evangelical denominations in the six New England States and the State of New York. I suppose if there be any preference in our religious anti-slavery professions and pretensions, it should be allowed to that body; that if there be any best to it, that is the best of it. And yet, what do we find? They could not agree in denouncing slavery as a sin of any such magnitude as to involve slaveholders universally, and went so far as absolutely to affirm it as their belief that slaveholders might be Christians! Now, then, if not only New and Old School General Assemblies, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and the American Tract Society, and the American Bible Society, and all the great popular ecclesiastical institutions and associations of our country, if not only these avow the doctrine that slavery is so mild, so gentle, so innocent an institution that even slaveholders may be Christians, but if, in addition to that, the very Church Anti-Slavery Society itself—the only one existing in the land—also affirms the same doctrine, then what wonder is it, I say, that the Belgian Churches and the Churches of Great Britain should make the same mistake, and believe that even the "sum of all villainies" is, after all, so light an offense that the very sacramental host of God's elect may practise it, without any impeachment of their Christian character?

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that it is partly our fault that such a mistake exists. I am afraid it is partly the fault of our association, in according so much of anti-slavery fidelity and character to these spurious institutions and associations of our country, that this terrible mistake has been made all over the civilized world; and I came to this meeting with the hope that we should be able to do something to correct that mistake. I do not care anything about the American Tract Society, Dr. Cheever can take care of that. I do not care anything about the American Bible Society; the New York Independent is watching that. I care very little about the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, Old School or New School; almost the whole of New England Orthodoxy condemns them. But my difficulty is, to so shape and so qualify the anti-slavery enterprise, that Christians (if they have that commodity in Great Britain and the Old World) may not make the mistake which those of Belgium appear to have made. I do not think it is for us to be particular about unmasking the American Tract Society, nor any of those large popular associations to which I have referred; but there is a necessity that we discriminate between true and false—between that which is real and that which is only apparent—between that which is a specious sham and that which is a stern and almighty reality; and we never shall do it until we take the institutions and associations mentioned in those resolutions which I read to the meeting, and class them where they belong—on the side of the oppressor, heart and hand.

It does not follow that we must consequently brand every man in those institutions at heart a slaveholder, but it is absolutely necessary that we make slavery so hateful and so horrible that the instincts of universal humanity will condemn it, and never dream that it is possible that a man can be a slaveholder and yet be a Christian. We have had scenes of a fearful character, of late, in Washington, and elsewhere; and I suppose no one would ever think it possible that Daniel E. Sickles could be a Christian, or his murdered victim much of a saint, or his wife, still living, any better than Mary Magdalen, after her conversion. But what is all that is terrible connected with those individuals compared with slavery? If every black Sickle in the South, whose bad and marriage rights have been invaded, could avenge his wrong in the same terrible manner, what a Golgotha, what a field of blood would not the whole South present to our view? (Applause.) And yet, we are to believe that the institution which multiplies that Washington tragedy ten thousand times ten thousand fold, is not so accursed but that men may be partakers in its guilt and yet be Christians!

Mr. Chairman, I, for one, have got tired of those mistakes. I fear I have had something to do with the authorship of them. I, too, have expressed my approbation of the position and the preaching of men like Dr. Cheever and Henry Ward Beecher; but yet, the vilest slave-breeder and slave driver in all the land is not vile enough to induce those men to withdraw their Christian fellowship and communion from him. Mr. President, what shall we think of it? Do you wish me, or does this Society wish me, to extend the right hand of anti-slavery fellowship to men who, however bold and faithful their denunciations against slavery, will yet clasp, in Christian brotherhood, the right hand of the murderous slaveholder of the South?

Now, I think one thing further ought to be said. The men for whom apology would oftenest be made—those good Christian men referred to in the Belgian protest, and by the Church Anti-Slavery Association recently formed in Worcester—the men in whose behalf exceptions are made—I have no doubt are the most guilty men of all; for the institution would crumble to pieces by its own rottenness if it were only cemented by such deprivacies as the hearts and hands of "Simon Legree"—would it not? It is your "Shellys" and "St. Clairs" who perpetuate the slave system; those men to whom Dr. Cheever gives the right hand of Christian fellowship. What can a "Simon Legree" do to perpetuate slavery? What can the miserable slave-breeder, who boasts that his beautiful females are soon to become mothers, himself the father of their children, do for the system? What can those men do who offer a reward of \$25 for the best specimen of an imported male African, as was done, not long since, by an

agricultural society in one of the counties of Georgia? Can anything be more clear, Mr. President, than that such men rain down odium on the institution? Why, the very electricity of their damning depravity would dash in pieces were it not for the lightning rods reared in its defence by your "Shellys" and "St. Clairs" (loud applause). And then, Dr. Cheever, and Ward Beecher, and the New York Independent, must extend to them the right hand of Christian fellowship, and the American Anti-Slavery Society must acknowledge them as real religious, Christian anti-slavery preachers and men! I comprehend not such logic.

I fear, Mr. President, that "judgment must begin at the house of God" in this matter, and that it is we ourselves who have yet to repent. When we shall have made slavery the atrocity that it is, and shall have denied to slaveholders and their abettors all right and claim to be considered other than thieves, adulterers and robbers, and when we shall have classed our Church Anti-Slavery Society and Boston American Tract Society with them, as they choose to class themselves, we shall at least have washed our hands from all participation in that guilt. And that is of more consequence than any other work we can ever do. "He that is not for us is against us," was the doctrine on Judea's plains eighteen hundred years ago. I do not believe that philosophy will ever change. Where is Henry Ward Beecher to-day? Where will he be to-morrow? Though entreated and besought to come to our platform and give his testimony in behalf of the anti-slavery movement, we see him not. But when that corrupt, conservative and absolutely criminal Tract Society invites him to its platform, he makes haste to comply. To-morrow, you must go there to hear him.

Mr. Chairman, I must bring my remarks to a speedy close, for my own sake as well as for yours, and for that of the audience. But one word in regard to the political aspect of the present movement. The Resolution refers to the Republican party; and there, again, I think, we have labored under a great mistake. That the party comprises, men, multitudes of men, whose hearts are right in the sight of God, I have no doubt, but the resolution affirms the truth in regard to them, that their sympathies, their purposes, their consciences, their acts, are all perverted, in consequence of the false and corrupt leadership of that party. When Stephen Arnold Douglas made his first speech apparently evidencing his defection from the Democratic party, I was much struck with the attentive ear that the Republican press and party of the North gave him; and though, only a few months before, they had absolutely corrupted the English language with their new terms of execration in regard to him and his position, that single speech seemed to be as effective as the prayer of the thief on the cross, and they made haste to exclaim with Stephen Arnold Douglas, "To-day shall thou be with us in our political paradise." At the very next meeting I addressed, I said that Stephen A. Douglas would be the next Presidential candidate of the Republican party. Of course, they hissed me furiously; but then, I was so used to that, I mistook it for their natural language (laughter and applause). However, I said then, "Perhaps that is too strong; but if not Douglas, it will be a strictly Douglas man." Here, I think, I was a little wrong. I do not like to make confessions, but I have to sometimes; for it has come to pass already that they have dropped nearly all non-slaveholding candidates, and the question with the party now is, which of a cline of slaveholders they shall select as their standard-bearer in the next Presidential campaign. Last Friday morning, the New York Tribune said editorially, and fortified it with any amount of circumlocution and amplification, that to-day there is no issue whatever between the Democratic and Republican parties involving the question of slavery, except it be the re-opening of the African slave trade, and on that question the Democratic party has not avowed an opinion. You may read it, any of you, in last Friday's Tribune. I know no other authority better than the New York Tribune, and I suppose that statement is true. Well, there was a whole column of comments in The Tribune on a letter of Mr. Bates, of Missouri. The Massachusetts Republican papers have published the letter of Mr. Bates, or extracts from it, and they affirm—at least one of them has affirmed—that if Mr. Bates is brought forward by Missouri in the next Republican Convention, with the promise that the State of Missouri will support him in the canvass, his claims cannot well be set aside. That is what the Republican press generally has said, so far as it has spoken, of Mr. Bates, and The Tribune has said even worse, but I have no time to read it. But I will read what Mr. Bates said:

"As to the negro question—I have always thought and often declared, in speech and in print that it is a pestilent question [that is what the Republican party generally begin to think], the agitation of which has never done good to any party, section or class, and never can do good, unless it be accounted good to stir up the angry passions of men, and exasperate the increasing jealousy of sections, and by those bad means foster some unfortunates into office, and keep some fit men out. It is a sensitive question, into whose dangerous vortex it is quite possible for good men to be drawn unaware. But when I see a man, at the South or the North, of mature age, and some experience, persist in urging the question, after the sorrowful experience of the last few years, I can attribute his conduct to no higher motive than personal ambition and sectional prejudice."

That is Mr. Bates, and here is a whole column of The Tribune, editorial, in apology for that man! Well, the other day I saw among other names mentioned as possible candidates for the Republican party, the name of Mr. Botts, of Virginia. He, too, has written a letter, and here is what he said:

"My position on the question of slavery is this, and so far from wishing to conceal it, I desire it should be known to all. Muzzles were made for dogs and not for men, and no press and no party can put a muzzle on my mouth, so long as I value my freedom. I make bold, then, to proclaim that I am no slavery propagandist."

He is, like Mr. Fremont, no "slavery propagandist." There is capital enough, you see, to set a man up as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States by the Republican party. But hear him a word further:

"I will resort to all proper remedies to protect and defend slavery where it exists [just like Mr. Seward there]; but I will neither assist in nor encourage any attempt to force it upon a reluctant people anywhere, and still less will I justify the use of the military power of the country to establish it in any of the Territories."

Good Fremont doctrine; good Republican sentiment. But there is one further remark, which I am afraid the parties who have mentioned his name did not read. He says:

"If it finds its way there by legislative means, it is all well; but never by force, through any instrumentality of mine. [That is what The Tribune says: if they want slavery in Kansas, let them have it.] I am myself a slaveholder, and all the property my children have in the world is slave property, inherited from their mother; and he who undertakes to connect my name, or my opinions, with abolitionists is either a knave or a fool, and

not unrequently both. And this is the only answer I have to them."

Mr. Chairman, I read these passages merely to show the probability, inasmuch as we have it now from The Tribune itself, there is no issue between the Democratic and Republican parties at the present time involving the question of slavery, that not Stephen A. Douglas, as I said, but some slaveholder, whose property is in slaves, and the property of whose children is in slaves, will be selected as the next standard-bearer of the Republican party.

Now, then, I think the same mistake that we have made in regard to the Church, in regard to Dr. Cheever, and those other institutions and individuals whose names I mentioned, we have also made in regard to politics, and that we are absolutely strengthening the hands of our enemies, and at our own expense, when we make it; until it has come to this now, that the Republican party turns round and reproaches the Anti-Slavery Society for its non-efficiency in the anti-slavery cause. They have accomplished all that they ever proposed to accomplish, and have done a great deal more than we did not dream of doing. When I hear Republicans talk in that way of the Anti-Slavery Society, especially of the American Society with its Executive Committee, its editors, its organs, and other appliances, I am reminded of the anecdote of an old slave in Virginia, who constituted the mate and all hands of a craft that plied up and down one of the rivers or bays of that State, with its cargo of onions and other vegetables, in which that State, sometimes finds occasion to deal when it is not wholly confined to the breeding of slaves. The captain was the owner of the craft. The slave's name was Mopus, but the latter syllable generally dropped, and then it was "Mope"—and a pretty expressive name, too. One night, the captain, having been beating about in rough weather for some time, and feeling quite tired out, as the night was clear, and the north star very conspicuous in the heavens, thought he would trust old Mopus with the helm and turn in and go to sleep. So he called Mopus to him to give him his directions, and told him to steer directly for the north star, and then went below and turned in. Well, old Mopus kept the schooner straight very well for a time, until by and by it occurred to him that he might as well smoke his pipe, and so he went to work to light it. While he was doing this, a breeze sprung up, the sail began to flap, he became a little confused, and before he had fully recovered his self possession, the vessel had wheeled right about, and was making straight for Point Comfort, from whence they had started. By and by the captain woke up, and, on going upon deck, saw that the schooner was headed the wrong way, began to swear at old Mopus, and ask him what he had been about. Said he, "Didn't I tell you to steer for the north star and here you have been running with it right astern." "Oh, yes," said Mopus, "gorry, massa, we passed the north star about an hour ago" (laughter). So it is with the Republican party; it has absolutely passed the north star, toward which it pointed in its beginning, and fancies that, while sailing directly back to slaveholders, slavery, and compromises with slavery, it is absolutely making the voyage successfully and prosperously (applause).

Mr. Chairman, how long shall we allow the people, through any lack on our part, to be thus deceived? Who will undeceive the Churches of Belgium and Great Britain? Who will undeceive the partially enlightened Democrats, and rescue them from such perdition of well-intended action, as is all action in the Republican party?

I have already exhausted my time and the little strength I have. I will simply say this, in closing, that if we shall at this Anniversary, succeed in drawing such a line of distinction between Slavery and Anti-Slavery that there shall be no such mistakes made hereafter, in Great Britain, in Belgium, even in our own country, as we now see are common and everywhere occurring, I fancy we shall have held the most important and most profitable Anti-Slavery anniversary ever held since our enterprise was first set on foot (loud applause).

OFFICERS

of the American A. S. Society elected to serve the coming year.

PRESIDENT.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, MASSACHUSETTS.

VICE PRESIDENTS.

PETER LIBNEY, Maine.

LUTHER MELEYD, New Hampshire.

JAMES M. HAWKES, "

JESUAL C. CLAPIN, "

FRANCIS JACKSON, Massachusetts.

EDMUND QUINCY, "

ASA FAIRBANKS, Rhode Island.

JAMES R. WHITCOMB, Connecticut.

SAMUEL J. MAY, New York.

CORNELIUS BRANHAL, "

AMY POST, "

PLINY SEXTON, "

LYDIA MOTT, "

LUCRETIA MOTT, Pennsylvania.

ROBERT PURVIS, "

EDWARD M. DAVIS, "

THOMAS WHITSON, "

JOSPH MOORE, "

ROWLAND JOHNSON, New Jersey.

ALFRED GIBBS CAMPBELL, "

THOMAS GARRETT, Delaware.

THOMAS DONALDSON, Ohio.

SARAH OTIS ERNST, "

BENJAMIN BARN, "

WILLIAM HEARN, Indiana.

WILLIAM HOPKINS, "

JOSEPH MERRITT, Michigan.

THOMAS CHANDLER, "

CYRUS FULLER, "

CARVER TOMLINSON, Illinois.

CARLEN GREEN, Minnesota.